

## REMARKS

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on July 26, 2004. Claims 1-19 are standing for examination. Claims 1-6, 15-16 and 18-19 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Light et al. (U.S. 6,192,380), hereinafter Light. Claims 7, 9-12 and 14 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Light as applied to claims 1 and 3, and further in view of Jacobs et al. (U.S. 5,611,048), hereinafter Jacobs. Claims 8, 13 and 17 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Light as applied to claims 1, 3, 9, 10 and 15, and further in view of Kraft et al. (U.S. 6,048,585), hereinafter Kraft.

Applicant has again carefully studied the prior art references provided by the Examiner, and the Examiner's rejections and statements of the instant Office Action. In response, applicant herein amends the claims to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the patentable subject matter of applicant's invention. Applicant further provides facts and argument which will clearly demonstrate that applicant's claims as amended distinguish unarguably over the prior art presented by the Examiner, either singly or in combination. Applicant also amends the specification to correct errors in identification of elements of the drawings.

Applicant has amended the language of claim 1 to specifically recite a function for returning and recording data that is a result of the form submission, and a function for user notification of data that is the result of the form submission and registration attempt, and that the instruction data of the instruction order includes authentication data for secure login, if required, and that the user notification includes registration status and authentication data accepted by the hosted site. For convenience, applicant reproduces claim 1 as amended below.

Claim 1 as amended now recites:

*1. (presently amended) A software application for populating and submitting interactive forms by proxy, comprising;*

*a function for finding and capturing data about a site associated with the form and about the form associated with the site;*

*a function for writing an executable instruction order containing data specific to the site, the associated form, and a requesting user;*

*a function for navigating to the site and submitting data to a host sponsoring the site using the form associated with the site;*

*a function for returning and recording a portion of the form-submitted data accepted by the host for subsequent use in gaining access to the site;*

*a function for returning and recording data that is the result of the form submission; and*

*a function for user notification of data that is the result of the form submission and registration attempt;*

*characterized in that the instruction order contains all of the required instruction data for navigating to and registering the user to the site, including authentication data for secure login, if required, and further characterized in that the user notification includes registration status and authentication data accepted by the hosted site.*

Applicant's independent claims 9, 15 and 19 recite the system, method and software application for practicing applicant's invention in accordance with the limitations of claim 1. Applicant accordingly has amended the language of the claims similarly to claim 1.

Regarding independent claim 19, the Examiner has stated that Light teaches that any new form information necessary for the site is added to the database containing a

user's form data, and that light also discloses a method in which the system stores new form information obtained from a site once the form-filling processes complete (col. 4, lines 5-36). Applicant argues, however, that the new stored data of Light is not obtained from the site hosting the completed form. Applicant respectfully points out that the data referred to in the portion of Light is obtained by scanning the completed form and recognizing the data manually entered into the form by the user. The returned and stored data, therefore, is not data that is specific to the site, and further, it is not data that is returned as a result of the submission; rather, it is simply new data specific to the user and to the form, but not specific to the site itself.

Further, applicant's independent claim 19 now specifically recites a function for providing user notification of data that is the result of the form submission, characterized in that the instruction order contains all of the required instruction data for navigating to and registering a user to the site, including authentication data for secure login, if required, and that the user notification includes registration status and authentication data accepted by the hosted site. Upon careful review of Light, there is nowhere any teaching or suggestion of returning any data whatsoever to the user, that is a result of the form submission and site registration, as is specifically recited in applicant's claim as amended. Applicant's independent claims 1, 9 and 15 now also recite these key and patentable limitations.

Regarding applicant's independent claim 1, the Examiner has also stated that any new form information necessary for the site is added to the database containing a user's form data (col. 4, lines 5-36). However, applicant fails to find any specific teaching or suggestion of returning any data to the user, that is the result of the form submission, and further, applicant can find no teaching or suggestion of a function for user notification of data that is the result of the form submission and registration attempt.

Referring now to applicant's specification, with reference to Fig. 10, it is specifically described beginning on line 14, that the navigation server 223 is adapted by

means of auto registration software, which is adapted to navigate to the target site on behalf of the user and register the user to the site or service, submitting all of the data required for site-registration, and returns accepted user-data back to domain 205. The data after registration to the site may include login names and passwords accepted for user registration at the hosted site.

However, applicant's specification specifically teaches, with reference now to Fig. 11, that that database refresh layer 237 comprises a user notification module adapted to notify a user upon successful registration and in some cases failed registration attempts. In some cases, a user may be disqualified from registration based on information such as credit rating or some other criteria, and in this event, a notice would be sent to the user. A presentation module used in conjunction with the notification module is provided and adapted to present any summary or refresh data to a user if it was requested before registration, and such data may be returned to the user along with registration confirmation and log-in data.

Referring now to applicant's specification with reference to Fig. 12, a process flow diagram illustrates various process steps for auto-registration to a site and receiving data from the site according to an embodiment of the present invention. The method comprises a step 295, in which if the registration fails, an attempt to determine the reason for failure is initiated, and notification may be sent to the requesting user explaining a given reason for failure. Auto-registration of the user to the target site may fail for various reasons, which may include non-qualification of the user, or that an error has occurred with respect to a data submitted such as an invalid credit card number, for a username or login code already in use by another subscribing user, or for a variety of other reasons. If a failure notice is displayed to the navigation server by the target site or service, the notice may be parsed for content with notification sent back to the user, and the user may then be required to update the selected user profile with the correct data, or possibly select an alternative user profile and reinitiate the registration process. In step

303, if auto-registration is successful, the accepted password and login data along with confirmation of the registration status is returned to the user by the user notification and user presentation modules.

The clear and advantageous distinction of applicant's invention, as is now recited in the independent claims as amended, is that data resulting from the form submission and registration attempt, including registration status (fail/success), and if successful, accepted login username/password data, is returned to the requesting user, such that the user is better informed of the registration status, and may subsequently choose alternate user profiles or authentication data to use for auto-registration to the target site.

The reference of Light, on the other hand, does teach that any new form information necessary for registering to the site is added to the database containing a user's form data, but there is clearly no specific teaching or suggestion of providing notification to the requesting user of registration status, including authentication data accepted by the posted targets site during auto- registration.

Applicant therefore believes that Light now clearly fails as a primary reference for a *prima facie* rejection of applicant's independent claims 1, 15 and 19 as herein amended and argued above, because the reference clearly fails to teach all of limitations now recited in the claims as amended. Depending claims 2-6, 16, and 18 are then patentable over Light on their own merits, or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

Claims 7, 9-12 and 14 are rejected as being unpatentable over Light as applied to claims 1 and 3, and further in view of Jacobs, and claims 8, 13 and 17 are rejected as being unpatentable over Light as applied to claims 1, 3, 9, 10 and 15, and further in view of Kraft. In view of applicant's above amendments to the independent claims and argument presented, Light fails as a primary reference for combining with the other references for reading on all of the limitations of applicant's independent claim 9 as amended, for the reasons outlined by applicant above on behalf of independent claims 1, 15 and 19. Claim 9 therefore, having similar limitations to the other independent claims,

is patentable as amended over Light in view of Jacobs. Depending 7, 10-12 and 14 are patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from a patentable claim. Claims 8, 13 and 17 are all depending claims, and are patentable as argued above, over Light in view of Kraft, on their own merits or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

It is therefore respectfully requested that this application be reconsidered, the claims be allowed, and that this case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this amendment, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Anand Rangarajan et al.

by   
Donald R. Boys  
Reg. No. 35,074

Donald R. Boys  
Central Coast Patent Agency  
P.O. Box 187  
Aromas, CA 95004  
(831) 726-1457